

DECEMBER 1951

MONTHLY REVIEW

AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

CIO AT A DEAD END

HARVEY O'CONNOR

THE LABOR PARTY'S NEXT TASK

A BRITISH SOCIALIST

MALTHUSIASM

HARRY GRUNDFEST

VOL. 3

8

EDITORS . . . LEO HUBERMAN . . . PAUL M. SWEETZ

CONTENTS

VOLUME THREE NUMBER EIGHT DECEMBER, 1951

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: Same Work—Different Unions; The Korean Truce Talks; Crisis in the Middle East and North Africa; The Eighty-Second Congress; German Unification Again; The British Election; Political Rights Are for Using	229
CIO AT A DEAD END by Harvey O'Connor	239
THE LABOR PARTY'S NEXT TASK by A British Socialist	243
MALTHUSIASM by Harry Grundfest	247
REFORMISM AND INTERNATIONALISM by Natalie Moszkowska	256

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly and copyright, 1951, in the United States, by MONTHLY REVIEW—AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE, 218 West 10th Street, New York 14, New York. Telephone: ORegon 5-6939.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One year—\$3.00 (foreign, \$3.50); two years—\$5.00 (foreign, \$6.00). Single copy 35c; 15 or more 25c. (Vol. 1 No. 1 \$2.00); (Vol. 2 No. 6 \$2.00).

EDITORS AND PUBLISHERS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

We have made no special pleas for funds this fall, and this fact may have lulled MR supporters into a complacent belief that everything is going fine and no assistance is needed. This is emphatically not the case. New subscriptions have not been coming in as fast as they were last year at this time, and during some recent months there has actually been a net decline in circulation. This is a danger signal. Unless there is a definite pick-up in the near future, we will be headed for serious trouble. We want, in all seriousness, to call this situation to your attention and to ask your cooperation in remedying it. *What we need above all else is new subscriptions—lots of them.* This is the last issue before Xmas, and we are again enclosing Xmas gift subscription blanks. Please make use of them!

We recently received the following letter, which speaks for itself:

May I beg your pardon for keeping the "incognito." I am a foreigner and for a short time in this country; may I add that I do not trust too much the freedoms granted by this capitalistic democracy.

I was really happy to discover your publication in the midst of the suffocating atmosphere prevailing on this side of the ocean. Happy not only from a selfish viewpoint (because it is a great pleasure seeing one's own thoughts put into print), but also from a more general viewpoint. It is a good thing that also in America, like in Italy (Nenni), in Israel (Mapam), etc., socialism has remained faithful to itself and

(continued on inside back cover)

SAME WORK—DIFFERENT UNIONS

In 1945, Joseph P. ("King") Ryan, lifetime President of the International Longshoremen's Association (AFL), made his usual back-door agreement with the New York Shipping Association. It was a ten-cent deal and the rank and file longshoremen of New York showed their disapproval by striking. Ryan went back into negotiations, and the final settlement, following upon an arbitrator's award, was an increase of twenty-five cents an hour.

In 1948, Ryan came up with another dime. Again the membership turned it down by walking off the job. This time, Ryan came out of reopened negotiations with thirteen cents.

A few weeks ago, Ryan, never fazed, turned up once more with the same old dime. And again the longshoremen walked off the job. During October and November, they tied up New York for twenty-five days, and the port of Boston went down as the result of a sympathy strike.

At this writing, a New York State fact-finding board is investigating the 1951 work stoppage. Chances are good that it will come up with a formula under which longshoremen will again get a little more than the ten cents that Ryan negotiated for them.

This kind of "collective bargaining" is nothing new for Joe Ryan. Back in 1934, the West Coast district of the ILA was out on strike. The strike committee in San Francisco was led by the president of the local, Harry Bridges. Ryan, already international head of the ILA, rushed into town, made a quick deal with the shipowners, and announced that the strike was over and that the men should return to work. The longshoremen of the West Coast told Ryan to go back where he came from. The men stuck to their demands and two months later won an outstanding victory. This marked the beginning of the end of Ryan and the ILA on the West Coast.

In the seventeen years since, the West Coast district of the ILA has become the powerful International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union. Rank-and-file leader Harry Bridges, as president of this union, has helped to build a loose federation of local unions into a strong, democratic rank-and-file trade union, with a record of achievements for the membership which is second to none.

MONTHLY REVIEW

Fortune magazine, in a recent review of the prospects for the ILWU since its expulsion from CIO and since Bridges' conviction and sentencing by a Federal Court, and after concerted raiding attempts by the AFL's Dave Beck and Harry Lundberg, captioned its report: "Harry Bridges: Please Omit the Obituaries." *Fortune* was right.

The remarkable contrast between what the ILWU has become and what the ILA continues to be is the real story behind the 1951 New York strike: it is the story of honest unionism versus racketeering.

The New York waterfront is a jungle, and the ILA is the organization through which it is kept that way.

The shape-up system of hiring, the corruption and the graft, the gangster control and the organized crime are an old story. One can safely predict that the present fact-finding board under Professor Martin C. Catherwood will come forward with no more startling revelations or recommendations than those made by Mayor Mitchell's Committee on Unemployment way back in 1916.

The fact that the New York port and its labor relations are a national and international scandal is not news. But what few realize is that New York, and other East Coast ports, are kept this way because the ship operators, the stevedoring companies, and the union officials have wanted it just like this. Despite the employers' sanctionious disapproval of mobsters and racketeers, the working longshoremen know that they'll have to lick their bosses, their union leaders, and the hoodlums, before they can end the rotten system that exists on the front today.

When a ship is loading or discharging cargo she's not making money for the owners. An idle ship is like an idle machine. The quicker the ship puts out to sea the quicker she starts earning again. This explains the shape-up. The ship-owners need longshoremen when cargo is being moved; the men are picked from the shape-up, finish the job, and are fired.

Some 30,000 longshoremen shape up every day in New York to get about 12,000 jobs. And the individual longshoreman sweats when he works because he knows that there is an idle and hungry man—maybe two—hanging around the piers behind him, ready to step into his job, and to sweat harder. So the sling loads get heavier, and the speed-up gets faster. If you complain, you're through.

A longshoreman doesn't know when he leaves his home in the morning to shape up on the waterfront whether he'll find work that will keep him going for an eighteen-hour stretch, or whether he'll go idle that day, and the next, and the next. Under this vicious system,

REVIEW OF THE MONTH

each shipowner tries to maintain a pool of longshoremen which will more than meet his maximum labor demands. The overall result is speed-up and exhaustion on the job, side by side with a chronic labor surplus and unemployment. The competition between the men for work is bitter. The power of the union stevedore boss who does the hiring is supreme.

And the ILA hierarchy under Joe Ryan is a fervent supporter of the shape-up; they extol its merits as lavishly as do the shipowners. Through the shape-up, the men are kept in line—they're in line for the boss and they're in line for the union racketeers. And the shape-up breeds the crime.

The District Attorney of the County of New York had this to say in his report covering the years 1946-1948:

The waterfront now competes with the city's most depressed slum areas as a spawning place of crime. This unhealthy condition, qualified authorities agree, results largely from the antiquated method of hiring labor, long in use on New York's docks. The lack of any assurance of regular employment and the complete dependence of the men on the favor of gang and dock bosses who do the hiring perfectly "set up" the industry for control by racketeers.

On the other hand, there is no shape-up in the ports where the ILWU has been established. And there is no organized waterfront crime or racketeering.

The greedy contempt with which the shipowners in New York still treat the longshoremen ended on the West Coast after the 1934 strike. Those easy pickings that came from the speed-up and the absence of a sling-load limit don't exist under the ILWU contract and the ILWU hiring hall with its system of rotary dispatching and hiring.

Historically, longshoremen have been paid high hourly rates because of the haphazard, unsteady, dangerous character of the work. The ILA continues to negotiate a high hourly rate—and nothing more. The ILWU has brought job security to the longshoremen while maintaining their take-home pay far above that of the East Coast men.

In decasualizing the West Coast industry the ILWU, under Bridges' leadership, gave the longshoremen the chance to earn a living as workers instead of scrambling about like animals. Because the longshoremen in the ILWU are rotated from a hiring hall in a manner which distributes all the work evenly among all of the men,

MONTHLY REVIEW

you get such comparisons in annual incomes as these for 1948:

INCOME GROUP	SAN FRANCISCO	NEW YORK
Less than \$2,500	9 percent	56.6 percent
\$2,500 to \$3,500	17 percent	31.3 percent
\$3,500 to \$4,000	25 percent	8.1 percent
\$4,000 to \$4,500	40 percent	3.0 percent
\$4,500 and over	9 percent	1.0 percent

Some 88 percent of the New York longshoremen earned *less* than \$3,500 in the year ending September 30, 1948, while nearly 75 percent of the San Francisco longshoremen earned *more* than \$3,500. Average annual earnings were \$2,400 in New York and almost \$4,000 in San Francisco.

Both the ILA and the ILWU have negotiated pension agreements. The ILA plan provides for \$35 per month exclusive of social security benefits; the ILWU plan provides for \$100 exclusive of social security benefits.

Same shipping companies, same cargoes, same work— different unions.

Longshoring is hard work. It's tough and it's dangerous. Most recent figures reveal stevedoring to be the third most dangerous industry in America—it's four times more dangerous to work on the waterfront than it is to work in a steel mill. The ILWU has therefore negotiated an elaborate and detailed safety program. This is part of the collective bargaining agreement, and disagreements between union and employer over safety conditions on the job are handled under the grievance procedure. The result of the vigorous insistence by the ILWU that safety was *not* the sole concern of management shows up in the employers' announcement that in 1950 injuries on the West Coast had reached the lowest point in 24 years.

In contrast, the ILA insists that safety doesn't even belong in a collective bargaining agreement. So said Harry Nasselgren, Secretary-Treasurer of the ILA, when testifying recently before the House Labor Committee on longshore safety legislation. He was supported by Bartly G. Furey, chief of operations for the Moore-McCormack Lines, who told the same committee: "I have been on the negotiating committee for approximately 10 years. Aside from five or six references to safety in our book, we have had no demands from the union whatever to inaugurate a safety code."

You can be sure that M. Furey likes it just as it is.

When asked why the West Coast stevedoring industry had such a code, Mr. Furey replied: "The West Coast people have a different frame of mind. The labor leaders out there are very aggressive and

they are willing to put the Constitution of the United States in the code if they can get it."

Some people think this wouldn't be a bad idea. If the Constitution were being policed today as militantly as the ILWU protects its coast-wide agreement, the Bill of Rights probably wouldn't be in its present tattered condition.

There is no magic formula in the Bridges leadership and the ILWU union. It was the victory in 1934 which set up the hiring hall and ended discrimination and black-listing. It guaranteed the continued life of the union.

The almost anarchistic democracy of the ILWU has flourished under Bridges because he himself is a product of the rough-and-tumble, give-and-take of the waterfront. He, more than anyone else, appreciates that the strength of the ILWU—forty percent of whose longshore members are Catholic—lies in the rank-and-file control that takes orders from no one. And the men continue to support him because they know he produces for them.

Compare the compulsory meeting attendance of the ILWU with the record of the ILA locals, which exist to peddle union books and sell jobs.

Compare the life-time job at more than \$600 a week (\$32,500 a year) plus expenses that keeps Joseph Patrick Ryan fat and florid, with Bridges' \$135 a week.

Compare Bridges' ILWU with Ryan's ILA in *every* respect and you get a picture that teaches an important lesson in the field of politics, too. The man so frequently denounced as a "red" heads an honestly-run, militant, democratic union, which delivers the goods for the workers; on the other hand, the man who, like Al Capone and his ilk, redbaits at every opportunity, heads one of the most undemocratic, racket-ridden, sell-out unions in the world.

Probably only a handful of the membership in the entire ILA know in any detail how the ILWU operates its hiring hall or how its democratic procedures keep control of the union in the hands of the men on the job. But they do know, and in the most personal and humiliating way, the rotten, crooked set-up of the ILA and of the work on the docks in the East Coast ports.

The longshoremen of the East Coast have yet to produce a rank-and-file movement strong enough to stand on its own legs, and bold enough to strike out on its own. When they do, they'll find leaders like Bridges in their own ranks. And this will mark the end of Ryan and his mob of ILA barons as well, who right now are using the 1951 strike to advance their own positions in the hierarchy of the ILA.

It will also mark a long and important step in the struggle of

American workers to establish a union movement which serves the interests of themselves and their class, not the interests of their bosses, their own leaders, or the capitalist system that exploits them.

THE KOREAN TRUCE TALKS

At the time of writing, the United States is still deliberately blocking the conclusion of a cease-fire agreement in Korea. The North Koreans and the Chinese have made one concession after another, but so far General Ridgway's negotiators have always been ready with new obstacles. So obvious has this become that George Barrett recently opened a report from Korea with the following statement:

Recent developments in the negotiations at Panmunjom for an armistice in the Korean war have convinced some troops on the fighting front that their own commanders, for reasons unknown to the troops, are throwing up blocks against an agreement. (*New York Times*, November 12, 1951.)

Actually, this behavior is entirely consistent with the whole pattern of the Korean war. The American military, though divided about whether to expand the Korean war, is united in clinging to it as too good a thing to give up. Messrs. Truman and Acheson, despite the obvious political advantages of peace which continually tempt them, shrink from the enormous problems which peace would bring. A limited war keeps the heat on the arms program which in turn protects the economy from collapse. It likewise maintains the Syngman Rhee regime in being and provides the only internationally usable excuse for refusing to come to terms with the Chinese Revolution.

But the policy of stalling is generating a whole new crop of problems. The Communists were to be forced to back down and to accept a sharp defeat: this was the main purpose of American rejection of the 38th Parallel as the demarcation line. Paradoxically, the difficulties which American policy is now running into arise precisely because the Communists have in fact backed down and accepted a defeat. By so doing, they have proved to the whole world the seriousness of their concern for peace; while the reluctance of the United States to accept its own victory throws a vivid light on the location of war-making forces in the world today. The diplomatic-political disadvantages of not stopping the limited war are catching up with the military-economic advantages of keeping it going.

Make no mistake: this is a situation of utmost danger. From the point of view of the Washington administration, there are two possible ways out. One is to stop the limited war. The other is to

turn it into an *unlimited* war. Once again the waverers between peace and war are being forced to the brink of decision. *It is a time for the peace forces to exert every ounce of pressure they can muster: the next few weeks may be decisive.*

CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICA

Meanwhile, the crisis of Anglo-American policy in the Middle East and North Africa is steadily building up. Washington is playing a devious game with Mossadegh, obviously hoping to snatch up the control of Iranian oil which slipped out of British hands during the summer and autumn. The imperial-minded Churchill government in Britain cold-shoulders the Washington-Mossadegh alliance and maneuvers to recover its position in Iran through its own Iranian puppets and sympathizers. Economic and political conditions inside Iran move inexorably toward a revolutionary situation. The Iranian Left gathers its forces and bides its time. The scribes and publicists of the capitalist world dutifully scream about the "threat" of "Soviet aggression." The political education of the masses all over the world advances another step.

In French North Africa, as in Indo-China, the last acts of France as a great imperialist power are being played out. The Moroccans and Algerians are very near to open revolt. And, as in Indo-China, the United States moves in to take over a situation the French can no longer control. The great American air bases in North Africa are not only for threatening the Soviet Union.

But it is perhaps in Egypt that the Middle East-North African crisis is most intense. *Business Week*, in its issue of October 27th, has an almost-Marxian analysis of the Egyptian problem. The glib public can be told that the root of the crisis is Moslem fanaticism or Russian Communism, but this sophisticated spokesman of the American ruling class knows better. The ascendant Egyptian political party, despite glittering electoral promises, has "delivered only additional misery in the form of higher living costs." At the peak of the Egyptian social pyramid are "pashas, beys, and effendis" who are allied with "wealthy landlords" and a "growing group of industrialists and financiers As a class, this top layer is irresponsible, bigoted, and greedy. It holds the peasant and worker in utter contempt A growing class of city workers lives in horrible slums. Working conditions are pathetic." And

at the bottom of the pyramid is the Egyptian fellow, the ignorant peasant. Seventeen million Egyptian fellahs—85 percent of the population—live in conditions scarcely changed since the days of

MONTHLY REVIEW

the Pharaohs. They are crammed into the Nile Valley at the rate of 1,400 to the square mile The fellah waters his animals in the Nile, bathes in the Nile, excretes in the Nile, and drinks from the Nile. The river that brings richness to the soil brings him disease and death. The birth rate—and the death rate—in the Nile Valley are the highest in the world There is evidence now, however, of a slow but real awakening to existence of better ways of living.

This, then, is the real nub of the Egyptian crisis, which "poses in an acute form the whole dilemma of the United States position in the Middle East." The situation is so serious "that the United States and its allies must develop a radically new policy in the Middle East in a hurry." And what should that policy be—encourage the revolutionaries who want to overthrow this unspeakably rotten society? Hardly. "Some United States Middle Eastern experts," says *Business Week*, plainly indicating its own agreement, "feel that the only policy that would have a chance of success now would be a barefaced return to old-fashioned gunboat imperialism—sugarcoated with a lot of economic assistance."

It seems that people all over the world may soon get another very instructive lesson—this time in the meaning of Point Four and how the "free world" makes nations "free."

THE EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

While we're quoting *Business Week*, let us quote from an editorial the following wholly adequate account of the accomplishments of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress which adjourned last month:

Enactments, [of the 82nd Congress] were historic. The \$61-billion voted for the armed forces was on a wartime scale. Military aid to our allies was expanded while economic aid tapered off. Troops for Europe were approved, a big program of overseas bases authorized, the draft law extended. A start was made on installing universal military service in the future.

On the domestic side Congress slapped the President down hard. Ignored were the central Fair Deal proposals of the 1948 and 1950 campaigns: the Brannan Plan, civil rights legislation, repeal of the Taft-Hartley act, compulsory sickness insurance. (Oct. 27, 1951.)

It is not surprising that *Business Week* finds the record of this Congress "not bad." But what is surprising is the absence of any effective protest from the American people. There *must* be latent resentment against this kind of crass sell-out; what is really lacking is leadership to give it political expression.

GERMAN UNIFICATION AGAIN

Another crisis is rapidly maturing in Germany. The pattern is familiar by now. Adenauer is opposed to the unification of Germany, primarily because it would mean his political downfall. The United States wants mercenary West German troops to back up its policy of forcing the Soviet Union to capitulate to American demands. On the other hand, the German people want unification on almost any terms short of war. The Soviet Union wants unification subject only to the condition that the disarmament and neutralization of a unified Germany be effectively guaranteed. These are the forces at work in Germany, and they are again building up pressure to a climax, as they did a year ago, after the first American proposal to re-arm West Germany.

As usual, Washington seems determined not to yield an inch, to continue backing Adenauer against the German people as it has backed Chiang Kai-shek against the Chinese and Syngman Rhee against the Korean people. But this policy has its Achilles' heel—it is absolutely incompatible with any serious effort to ease the tensions between East and West and to lift the crushing burden of armaments from western Europe's faltering economies. Just as holding onto Chiang and Rhee has cost Washington dear in Asia, so holding onto Adenauer may cost it dear in Europe. There is a limit to the sacrifices the British and French and Italian and other western European peoples will endure to further someone else's ambition to dominate the world.

THE BRITISH ELECTION

We print elsewhere in this issue a report from our British correspondent on the situation in Britain following the slim victory of the Tories in the October general election. On the whole, it is an optimistic and hopeful report. The Labor Party, sparked by the rank and file, put on a good campaign and more than held its own in terms of the popular vote. The Bevanites, who had criticized the pace of rearmament and the extent of British subservience to the United States, did well. Several who seemed sure to be defeated were returned with safe majorities. All signs point to a vigorous revival of the working-class movement and to a genuine swing to the Left. The Bevanite leadership, which is certainly confused and vacillating when it comes to a positive program, may find itself driven to greater clarity and greater determination by the energy of the rank and file. The British working class is a sleeping giant. In waking, it can shake the world.

Meanwhile, there are those who fear that the victory of the

MONTHLY REVIEW

Tories may increase the war danger. We do not share this view. The opposition to the Cold War policy in the country will be much stronger and more vocal with Labor in opposition; the right-wing Labor leadership, which could count on the extraordinary loyalty of the membership as long as it controlled the government, will lose much of its influence. On the other side of the coin, Churchill and Eden have no more desire than Attlee and Morrison to commit national and political suicide in the interests of American world domination: on the contrary, they are likely to try harder than Attlee and Morrison to save what is left of the Empire from falling into the clutches of the Americans. At this stage of world history, any intensification of inter-imperialist conflicts is all to the good. When thieves fall out

We send fraternal greetings to our British socialist comrades—those who really mean business. They have an unparalleled opportunity to further the cause of peace and socialism. May they make the most of it!

POLITICAL RIGHTS ARE FOR USING

You often hear people in this country lament: "What's the use? The Left has no mass following; what's the good of sticking your neck out? Better keep quiet and wait until the outlook is more promising." The best answer to this that we've yet seen was given by Tom Emerson in his presidential address to the National Lawyers' Guild at its October meeting in Chicago:

It so happens—fortunately at the present juncture—that [keeping inviolate the methods and spirit of political freedom] is a task in which even a small group can play a significant role. Just as it is true that the suppression of one group threatens the rights of all, so it is true that free expression by one group safeguards the rights of all. The insistence, even by a relatively few, upon the full exercise of political freedom keeps alive and vigorous the entire tradition. It gives heart and strength to many others who may be less favorably situated to claim their rights. It serves as an invigorating example to all that the tradition stands firm and unbroken.

Read that again. Remember it. Make use of it. There is no more important, and basically no more encouraging, message to give to American radicals in the dark days through which we are now passing.

(November 15, 1951)

CIO AT A DEAD END

BY HARVEY O'CONNOR

CIO, in its 16th year and after its 13th convention in New York early in November, finds itself up against dead ends at every turn of the road.

Nowhere is the dead end more painfully apparent than in the search for leadership. Philip Murray, ageing, ill, and burdened with the problems of the United Steelworkers which he also heads, wants to retire as president of CIO. But all efforts to find a suitable successor have run up against a dead end. There is no one in CIO with the platform personality, the magnetism, and the backing of the Big Three unions—steel, auto, and clothing—to fill the office. After conceding the futility of the search for a successor, the CIO inner council compromised by relieving Murray of routine details and transferring them to Allan S. Haywood, also an old coalminer.

Although CIO claims it was never stronger numerically than now, its leaders admit that it has reached a dead end in organizing. They blame it on Taft-Hartley, the convenient scapegoat for labor's failures. But Haywood, director of organization, indicated the dead end when he pointed to CIO's main victories in that field in the past year—all representing raids on organized workers in other unions, mostly left-wing.

At a time of full employment, when organizing should be relatively easy, the leaders admit that not only are two-thirds of the American working class unorganized, but that there is no immediate prospect of making much headway in correcting the situation. With Taft-Hartley blamed for this impasse, there is obviously no need for the leaders to re-examine their own policies which have blunted the appeal CIO once had for the unorganized millions.

CIO's political dead end is perhaps the most immediately obvious of all. Here, top leadership is divided on the question of supporting Truman. The United Auto Workers leadership, as voiced by President Walter P. Reuther and Secretary Emil Mazey, assailed Truman savagely for his "feeble" and "inept" efforts to make good on the Fair Deal. They declared that the political trick of blaming labor's political defeats on the reactionary Congress could not excuse Truman from responsibility for handing the defense program

Harvey O'Connor, a regular contributor to MR, covered the CIO convention for Federated Press. He is the author of Mellon's Millions, The Guggenheims, and Steel—Dictator.

MONTHLY REVIEW

over to Big Business, for packing the Supreme Court with his cronies, and for failing to back up government employees against the infamous star chamber "loyalty" boards.

In his concluding speech to the convention, Murray defended his loyalty to Truman. Now, he said, labor is represented on the top advisory boards in Washington and has access to Truman at any time. But his scathing comments on other aspects of the Washington scene indicated that labor has little to show for its representation except that it can protest in the highest circles against what the monopoly crowd is doing to the American people.

The steel-clothing leaders are not impressed by the flamboyant, pseudo-socialistic approach to national issues taken by Reuther. Off the record, they point to Reuther's inability, with hundreds of thousands of members in Detroit, to elect a pro-labor mayor. Year after year, Chamber of Commerce men are returned to the mayor's chair in the auto capital. But in nearly every steel town in the north—from Pittsburgh and the western Pennsylvania steel valleys across to Gary and Indiana Harbor—the steel workers' union has friendly mayors and sheriffs: valuable assets in time of strike. When Reuther, with his tremendous membership in Detroit, can do as much, the steel and clothing workers' officials will be somewhat more impressed by his advice on national political strategy.

Split among themselves and burdened with Truman, CIO leaders find it impossible to get PAC clicking among the rank and file. Typical is the story of one union director who took over the job of selling \$1 PAC cards to his members when his staff had failed completely. He failed, too. Then he threw away the PAC cards and got receipt books from a pro-union congressman CIO was supporting. He sold 137 \$1 slips to the same men who had turned him down on PAC.

CIO may not have reached the dead end of its anti-Communist crusade, but it did reach an all-time high in absurdity when the president of the railroad trainmen, a guest speaker, related how he had received an invitation from the Rumanian railroad workers' union to visit their country. This he contrived to turn into a sinister plot to lure him behind the Iron Curtain to be "duped" and "drugged" so he might return to this country to sabotage the American railroad system by strikes, dynamite, and violence. The press table guffawed at this exhibition, staged with the help of a professional New York publicity firm. The *New York Times* gave it a scant paragraph near the bottom of its day's report on the convention. But the Hearst and McCormick papers gave this yarn the biggest play of any story from the convention.

While there were pretty clearly no Communists among the delegates, Communism itself was present in nearly every speech from the platform and in nearly every resolution. At times, it seemed that the subject matter of resolutions might defy an effort to tie it in with Communism, but this was nevertheless achieved. Some sharp anti-Communist strategists, eyeing the growing indifference of delegates to this line, expressed the fear that too continued use of anti-Communism, as with penicillin, may build up an immunity to the drug.

More serious to CIO is the absence now from its lower ranks of thousands of younger leaders who once spearheaded the drives that made CIO the terror of reaction. Now they are active in independent or AFL unions, have gone back to the shops and mills as rank-and-file workers, or have found themselves niches in the economic system where they hope to live out the blizzard against the time when another great upsurge can be expected in the labor movement.

About the only note of realism on the economics of "peace through strength," preached endlessly, came in the remarks of the president of the Canadian Congress of Labor, CIO affiliate. Hoping, he said, and even the word "hope" sounded fantastic in the atmosphere of the Hotel Commodore's ornate ballroom, that there might be a truce soon in Korea and a settlement with Russia eventually, the CCL is planning against the possibility that peace may "break out," bringing unemployment in its wake. But there was no such planning within CIO, nor did anyone care to look into the abyss which would be created by carving \$50-70 billions a year out of the United States budget. The awful fact of the corruption of the labor movement by huge war expenditures was all too obvious.

In this convention, compounded of frustration, none wondered aloud about the rotten foundation under the booming American economic system, or asked the question that many simple people throughout this country are now asking: Is the only choice between war and breadlines?

Although CIO is at a dead end, it is far from dead. It is making a genuine effort—within the narrow limits imposed by support of the crusade against Communism—to turn back the current onslaught on the living standards of its members. Murray told off all the economic, price, and wage stabilizers who came up from Washington to plead to labor to do the sacrificing in the war program. Even labor leaders are still touchy in the pocket nerve. CIO will match its sacrifices against those of Big Business, Murray told them, and then he revealed how monopoly is getting away with the "wholesale raping of the American people." Probably no top leader in govern-

MONTHLY REVIEW

ment ever got a ruder or blunter answer from labor than Murray administered to Economic Stabilizer Eric Johnston when he tried to soft-soap the delegates into accepting "inequality of sacrifice" and liking it.

The 13th convention was a backdrop for the fight the steel workers are facing in breaking through the wage freeze this winter, and Murray made the best use of it he could. His hand was strengthened, if not forced, by the deepening unrest among his own steel workers. And back of him on the ballroom stage of the Commodore some could see the glowering figure of John L. Lewis, his massive brows shading eyes intent on the man who succeeded him as head of CIO. The miners, it is reported, do not intend to let the wage freeze stop them, either, this winter.

Murray showed to best advantage in his personal appeal to the delegates to tackle the issue of racial discrimination down deep in the ranks of the local unions. Brushing to one side as totally inadequate the mere passing of resolutions, Murray said CIO shelters bigots as poisonous on race relations as any Ku Kluxer. While Walter Reuther in a dramatic speech emphasized that on this issue we were losing to Communism the battle for men's minds all over the world, Murray stressed plain human decency as an adequate reason for treating Negroes as brothers.

In his talk to the delegates after his re-election as president, Murray tried to recall some of the fire which years ago made CIO a powerhouse for progress. He warned against the danger of the organization turning into a "club for fat, bald-headed old men" and warned union officials that they are nothing but the servants of the rank and file.

Delegates listened attentively, and some recalled the old glow that lighted CIO. But many, now enjoying stabilized membership, find more agreeable companionship with the upper echelons of government in Washington where they enjoy comradeship in the cold war against Communism, rather than in the rugged, monotonous, but eternal war that is being waged in the mines, mills, and factories against monopoly and its "wholesale raping of the American people."

A labor movement uninspired by socialism would be like a motor without petrol, a body without a soul.

—Keir Hardie, 1906

THE LABOR PARTY'S NEXT TASK

BY A BRITISH SOCIALIST

The Tory party won its narrow and unsatisfying victory only by the chances of the British system of elections. After six years of intensive propaganda, which has made the most of the hardships of austerity, and after the expenditure of several million pounds, it still failed to win a majority of the popular vote. Labor remains the largest party in the country, polling 13.9 millions to the 13.6 millions given to the Conservatives, and the 700,000 won by the rump of the Liberals. In the face of a sustained Tory offensive, and despite the weaknesses shown by the Labor leadership in the past eighteen months, the Labor Party was able to add 650,000 votes to the total secured in February 1951. This, in the circumstances, was a great achievement, and a real tribute to the energies of the rank and file who, in one constituency after another, took control of the campaign with an enthusiasm which shamed the tired defeatism of many of the party leaders.

Nevertheless, the Tories won the election. The reasons are not difficult to find. First, the redistribution of seats that took place in 1949 left the electoral system with a decided bias against Labor. Whereas the Tory vote is spread fairly evenly throughout the country, Labor piles up huge (and wasted) majorities in many industrial and mining areas. It is estimated that more than half a million Labor votes must be written off as electorally useless: to win decisively, therefore, Labor must poll something like 750,000 more than the Tories. Secondly, the Tories organized the mail vote—put at something like 1.6 millions—far more successfully than Labor, with far fewer full-time party workers, has been able to do. In at least a dozen constituencies, the Tory mail vote was much larger than the final Tory majority. Thirdly, though a high national poll—again over 82 percent—helps Labor, there is no doubt that superior Tory organization managed to turn out a larger percentage of the potential Tory vote than the percentage of possible Labor votes that was delivered, especially in critical and marginal seats.

But the fourth reason is the most significant. Last time, the Liberals contested 487 seats. This time, lacking funds and organization, they fought only 109. Last time, 109 Tories and 76 Laborites

The author is MR's regular correspondent in Britain. His last article, "The British Peace Movement," appeared in last April's issue.

MONTHLY REVIEW

were sent to Westminster on minority votes, the Liberal candidate in a three-cornered fight polling more than the victor's plurality. Thus, in such constituencies, in the absence of a Liberal candidate, the division of the Liberal vote was crucial. More Liberals swung Right than Left: nationally, the ratio seems to have been about two Tory to one Labor, and this tiny shift, amounting to little more than one percent, was decisive. Seventeen of the twenty-three seats that Labor lost were in constituencies where the Liberals withdrew this time, and where the previous Labor majority was in any case numbered in hundreds.

The amazing feature of this election, however, was the stability of the vote in the constituencies where this Liberal problem was unimportant. You can go through the list of results and find one case after another where the Labor and Tory votes are virtually identical with the figures polled eighteen months before. The Liberals apart, the British electors seemed to have chosen their sides and to have stuck to them with amazing loyalty. Such repetition, incidentally, suggests that the opinion polls erred badly in reporting a serious slump in Labor's following in the middle of this year. Since, at the outset of the election, Gallup first set Labor's poll at 38 percent, and the actual result was 48.8 percent, one must suppose either that the poll was badly wrong, or that in a short campaign Labor rallied its voters more successfully than anyone has ever given a campaign credit for doing before.

There is no doubt, however, that Labor's campaign *was* far more successful than that waged by the Tories. Both, in a sense, were negative, since neither party put forward any detailed solution to the series of crises now facing Britain. Both parties capitalized on their supporters' fear of the other's social policies. But Labor, faced with Tory taunts about "weakness" in Iran, and pressed by its own rank and file, rather surprisingly decided to fight the election mainly on the issue of peace. "To Save The Peace—Vote Labour" the posters ran. Labor spokesmen and candidates greeted the Tory gibes of "cowardice" with the suggestion that if the Tories were not conscious warmongers, at least they were unlikely to follow a policy which could save the peace. The curious outcome was an election campaign in which "Peace" suddenly became respectable as an issue in British politics, overshadowing the customary controversies about housing, social services, economic controls, and nationalization.

So far as some of Labor's leaders are concerned, this development was somewhat disingenuous. After all, until Ernest Bevin's death, they had sought to follow a bi-partisan foreign policy, and the break with the Tories that came after Herbert Morrison's appointment as Foreign Secretary was not due to differences over the Cold War but

over imperial policy. But once the party officially decided to fight the election as the champions of peace, the rank and file seized their opportunity. Up to the election, those who spoke of peace were usually regarded as secret sympathizers of the Stockholm peace movement. Such inhibitions and distinctions were swept away in the campaign. Whether the leadership desired it or not, the Labor Party in the country was transformed into a peace party, and the Labor electorate responded enthusiastically. Such was the strength of this appeal that the Tories had rapidly to drop their demands for a "tough" policy and switch, in the last week before the polls, to a "me-too" line on peace. A closely related aspect of the campaign, and one which may seem astonishing to Americans, was an almost total absence of redbaiting. There were no attacks on the Soviet Union or on the British Communist Party, and in many constituencies there was even a *de facto* united front between Laborites and Communists. This was in sharp contrast to the last election campaign.

These developments, of course, were linked to the question of Bevanism. At the Scarborough Conference of the Labor Party, held at the beginning of the campaign, the Bevanites had scored a striking triumph in the elections to the National Executive. The vote showed that the constituency Labor Parties, which are the active party organizations in the country, had swung heavily towards Bevanism. The block vote of the trade unions still ensured that a majority on the Executive would be from the Right and Center of the Party. But Bevan and his supporters returned to the Executive with a strong vote of confidence from the rank and file.

Naturally, the Tories made as much use as they could of the "danger" of Bevanism, and painted a gloomy picture of Labor's house divided against itself. The right-wing Laborites had predicted that the party split would be ruinous in the elections and secretly hoped for the defeat of the Bevanites. In the event, the split proved an asset to Labor. The promise of a more militant and radical policy stirred the Labor rank and file out of lethargy and defeatism and brought many dissident voters back into the fold. All the leading Bevanites—Bevan himself, Mikardo, Driberg, Barbara Castle, John Freeman, Geoffrey Bing, and Harold Wilson—were returned, though at least four of them held seats that were so marginal as to suggest certain defeat. All the candidates who declared themselves Bevanites did well, many of them actually increasing the Labor poll in their districts, and the Left of the Parliamentary Party will certainly be as strong numerically, and probably stronger politically, than before.

This raises important issues for the future of British socialism. For the first time since the war, there is now a strong socialist nucleus in the party around which the rank and file can coalesce.

The policy of that nucleus is thus of the utmost importance.

In opposition, Labor always tends to move to the Left. The militants are no longer inhibited by the need to maintain a precarious government majority. They can force divisions in the House when they please and in debates they can take a forceful lead. The Bevanites can become the leading spokesmen of Labor opinion in the House and in the country as a whole. But they can do this successfully only if they now develop a coherent socialist policy. It would be futile and dangerous for them merely to harp on the defects of Tory rule. It would be inadequate for them simply to attack the reactionary foreign policy which the Tories are bound to follow. They must work out a clear and positive socialist solution to the economic and political crisis which now presses heavily upon Britain. The epoch in which the Welfare State was sufficient is now closing, as the conditions which made the Welfare State possible disappear. Labor in office proved unable to adjust itself to this change and to go beyond the program with which it won in 1945. But Labor can neither return to power, nor prove effective if it did, unless the present term in opposition is used to develop a comprehensive socialist policy and to educate once again a new generation of socialist militants, equipped to face the dangers which threaten Britain.

The policy of the right-wing Laborites is bound to be one of moderation—the phrase “constructive opposition” has already been used. They believe that the narrow Conservative victory will suffice to prevent Churchill from attacking the achievements of Labor in social policy, and from doing much to satisfy the Tory diehards. What they do not understand—but Bevan understood all along—is that the British economy *cannot* carry the planned arms program and still maintain the living and social standards established in the last six years. The Labor government was already breaking up on this issue. A Tory government, if it presses ahead with rearmament, *cannot* avoid drastic cuts in living standards. That is when the trouble will start and when the Bevanites’ chance will come. But Bevan and his followers cannot simply oppose rearmament. They must come forward with a foreign policy which offers some hope of reducing world tension, so that the burden of arms may be cut, and Britain’s resources devoted once again to peaceful and constructive ends.

In this election, many Labor candidates insisted that the struggle for socialism and the struggle for peace are inseparable. The Labor voters understood that equation. The task now is to define it more specifically in terms of policy. If this can be done, then the British working-class movement may take a great step forward. This defeat could be the point at which it moves from laborism to socialism.

MALTHUSIASM

BY HARRY GRUNDFEST

Popularizers of "scientific" Malthusian population doctrine are fortunate indeed that few of their readers trouble to read Malthus' own *Essay on the Principles of Population*. Only the first six pages of the *Essay* sketch (without proof) the thesis that human populations grow in geometric ratio (2:4:8:16:32, etc.) while the food supply can only grow in arithmetical ratio (1:2:3:4:5, etc). Malthus from then on considered this thesis "self-evident." Part of his book is an inconsequential enumeration of population trends in different countries—including some pornographic and racist accounts of sex habits among primitive people. The part of the *Essay* which he considered most important, however, is his discussion of the value and implications of his theory.

Malthus is at pains to show that the condition of the poor cannot be improved. Addicted to the "vice and misery" of their "incomplete discipline of human passions," they tend to multiply beyond the limits of the means of subsistence. Consequently "misery" in the form of starvation, disease, and death brings the retribution of a natural, adjusting mechanism to keep the population in check. He offers, therefore, "a doctrine which attributes the greatest part of the sufferings of the lower classes of society exclusively to themselves."

Nor is Malthus as bashful as his successors in proclaiming the utility of his theory. "If . . . the lower classes could be convinced that by the laws of nature, independently of any particular institution except the great one of property, which is absolutely necessary in order to attain any considerable produce, no person has any claim of *right* on society for subsistence if his labor will not purchase it, the greatest part of the mischievous declamations on the unjust institutions of society could fall powerless to the ground." The "laboring classes" would then be encouraged "to bear an unavoidable pressure with patience."

Armed with his theory, Malthus "demolished" contemporary proponents of "the rights of man"—Wallace, Condorcet, Godwin, Owen, and Paine. He even took issue with Adam Smith by opposing

Dr. Grundfest is a neurophysiologist and Associate Professor of Neurology at the College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University.

the "right to subsistence" and favoring the corn laws which raised food prices for the benefit of a minority. Though claiming to be among "the warmest friends of genuine liberty," he was against universal suffrage and a regularly meeting (annual) parliament. He advocated abolition of even the miserable benefits which were given the indigent by the poor laws of his day, and was opposed to mutual aid societies, favoring savings banks instead as "enabling the poor to provide against contingencies themselves." Although a minister (belonging, it is true, to a celibate group) he wrote: "We must on no account do anything which tends directly to encourage marriage, or to remove in any regular and systematic manner the inequality of circumstances which ought always to exist between the single man and the man with a family." In the England of the early crises of capitalism and its class warfare among the crown, the country gentlemen, the rising industrialists, and the proletariat, he praises the country gentlemen who "have given up to the crown a part of their birthright of liberty . . . actuated by a real and genuine fear that it was then in greater danger from the people than from the crown." "It is more the ignorance and delusion of the lower classes of the people that occasion the oppression, than the actual disposition of the government to tyranny," concluded this "friend" of "genuine liberty."

Faced with such an unashamed defense of entrenched privilege, it is small wonder that Marx treated Malthus with unconcealed contempt. In *Capital* he called the *Essay* a "schoolboyish, superficial plagiary," and attributed its popularity "solely to party interest." As Marx saw it, "the French Revolution had found passionate defenders in the United Kingdom; the 'principle of population' . . . was greeted with jubilation by the English oligarchy as the great destroyer of all hankerings after human development."

Malthus predicted that the population of England would double or treble within two or three centuries. Actually, it more than trebled in the hundred years following 1820. Yet, in the face of this "population pressure," England's standard of living improved very substantially during this period. The facts disproved Malthus' theory and gave point to his own lame admission that "many countries at the period of their greatest degree of populousness had lived in the greatest plenty and have been able to export corn; but at other periods when their population was low have lived in continual poverty and want and have been obliged to import corn."

Nor did the theory fare better in other respects. The rising standard of living in Britain and other European countries led not to a higher birth rate as Malthusian doctrine would lead one to expect, but to a steadily declining birth rate. Furthermore, through

advances of science and technology the potential food supplies have always remained far ahead of needs on a world scale. Very recently, a Finnish agricultural scientist and Nobel Prize winner embarrassed current Malthusian propaganda by stating that enough agricultural resources exist today to feed twice the present population of the world, and other Nobel laureates predicted that still new resources would become available in the future. R.R. Kuczynski, one of the leading contributors to demographic methodology, has estimated (*Population*, 1930) that foreseeable technological developments would permit a world population of 11 billion.

Yet despite the long history of facts disproving Malthusian prognostications, and despite the scientifically untenable basis of Malthus' pseudo-mathematics, Malthusian population doctrine is once again in great favor. One of the most popular of recent books is Vogt's *Road to Survival* (1948), with its mystique of "biotic potential" and "environmental resistance," and phrases such as "un-trammeled copulation" of "spawning millions" which are reminiscent of Malthus' celibate strictures against the "vice" of having children. Vogt's attacks on the striving for human dignity are less openly angled than were those of Malthus, but they repeat the same arguments, though now they are directed against the people of the colonies and of undeveloped countries.

A new book, R.C. Cook's *Human Fertility—the Modern Dilemma* (1951) is blessed with an introduction by Julian Huxley and combines Malthusian ideas of class and race superiority with similar notions based on the "science" of eugenics. Its main thesis can be deduced from the following quotation: "Today, in the United States, the intelligent get degrees, and the diligent and competent get houses and bank accounts and stomach ulcers. But it is the poor and unschooled who beget." (P. 238.). Thus, "economic and educational success works eugenic miracles in reverse in an industrial society." This is a loaded and class-angled statement of the facts of differential fertility in our social system. But somehow, "economic and educational success" gets associated by Cook with hypothetical "plus" and "minus" genes for intelligence. Because of the higher fertility of the lower socio-economic groups, our society is now threatened, he warns, with "slow and remorseless biological extinction" through a process of "genetic erosion"—a concept and term not to be found in the standard genetics literature, and having the same mystical quality as Vogt's "biotic potential." According to Cook, our "biological extinction" is approaching ever faster, because science is now saving the lives of more infants of the poor who would otherwise have died. Lest I seem to exaggerate, I point out that one reviewer—Orville Prescott in the *New York Times*—having swallowed the

MONTHLY REVIEW

story, promptly reached a conclusion captioned "Science: Curse in Disguise."

This mixture of eugenics with differential birth rates is then further mixed up with Malthusian doctrine. The utility of such a concoction is obvious. Statistics of differential fertility show that it is the "lower classes" who have the most children. By having children, these lower beings perform a disservice by eroding our fine heredity. How much more, then, should we loathe the inferior races who insist on overcrowding their lands and eroding not only their own (presumably, already low) intelligence, but our own too!

A skeptic cannot help wondering somewhat about "genetic erosion." If this process has been going on since the poor have been with us, it must be very ancient indeed. By appropriate pseudo-mathematics it can be shown that Adam and Eve had the only "uneroded" genetic constitution. On the other hand, we know they were not very intelligent until they ate of the tree of knowledge; and besides, they got thrown out of Eden. By Mr. Vogt's process of "untrammelled copulation" they then "spawned" their millions to cause anguish to Messrs. Malthus, Vogt, Cook, and other Malthusians.

Be that as it may, the only kind of data Cook gives us is again about "overpopulation" brought on by the effects of accursed science. The American colony of Puerto Rico is his chief example. In that poverty stricken island, medical science has decreased mortality, particularly of infants, but social conditions make for a high birth rate. This has resulted in a rapidly growing population, which now has a density of over 600 persons per square mile. Cook holds that the resources of the island are inadequate to sustain the population. From this "overpopulation" he believes, stems the misery and poverty of Puerto Rico and its explosive bitterness.

He dismisses the effects of a colonial, exploitative monoculture of sugar, which demands from the workers a few months of exhausting work and then leaves them unemployed for the rest of the year. He dismisses also the effects of the plantation system which leaves only a few tiny uneconomic peasant holdings, and the inability of a fertile agricultural community with extremely high farm land values to grow more than 50 percent of its own food supply. I shall not spend further time refuting Mr. Cook on Puerto Rico *per se*. If a theory is to be held in respect it must be applicable to a variety of situations. Accordingly, I shall examine first the entire Caribbean area of colonial territories. The data are taken from a paper by Dr. S. D. Neumark at the Fourth West Indian Conference of the UN Food and Agriculture Organization, held at Curaçao in 1950. These

territories have much the same economic and social structure as Puerto Rico. Population densities range from 0.8 per square mile for French Guiana to over 1200 per square mile for Barbados. Yet Barbados probably has a higher standard of living than does Puerto Rico. At any rate, the standards of living in the entire area are nearly the same despite population densities varying 1500 fold.

Next, we can examine the problem on a world-wide basis. I have tabulated the rounded figures for population densities of some "poor" (backward) and some "rich" (advanced) countries.

"POOR"		"RICH"	
Surinam (Dutch W.I.)	4	Belgium	800
Bolivia	10	England & Wales	750
Belgian Congo	13	United Kingdom	500
Colombia	26	Holland	610
Iran, Iraq	30	Italy	400
Philippines	175	France	200
India	250	Scotland	170
Martinique (F.W.I.)	615	Spain	140

These figures bring out a number of facts:

(a) "Poor" countries are so, independently of their population densities, and despite possession of rich agricultural and/or mineral resources.

(b) Colonies may have much lower population densities than their "mother" countries, and much richer resources (for example, Surinam and the Belgian Congo), and yet be very much poorer.

(c) There is no correlation between the population density and the living standards of the "rich" countries, which rank in the latter respect about as follows: England, Scotland, France, the Low Countries, Italy and (far behind) the least populated, Spain.

(d) There is, however, a direct correlation between living standards as just ranked and industrialization. The living standard of Spain, the least industrialized, though also the least densely populated, is almost as low as is that of the Arab countries. Of special interest is a comparison between the current shortage of labor in the United Kingdom (500/sq. mi.) and the traditional "overpopulation" of Italy (400/sq. mi.) which has, at present, over 2 million unemployed.

(e) All the "poor" countries also have one common factor: they are industrially underdeveloped, and their resources are exploited extractively for the (capitalist) world market.

These facts fly in the face of Malthusian "explanations" and

MONTHLY REVIEW

demand a more general answer. This of course exists, but it is unpalatable. The poverty of a country is determined not by "population pressure," but by absence of industrialization and by the degree of exploitation of its resources for the benefit of foreign capital.

Since the Malthusian explanation for the poverty of "overpopulated" countries is demonstrably invalid, it might be expected that the "remedies" offered by neo-Malthusians would be, at the most, silly. But this is not the case. These remedies are usually downright inhuman. As an example I quote from Cook (p. 83) the following "program" offered for China by Dr. Gerald Winfield in his book, *China: the Land and the People* (1950): "It is obvious that the first objective of the medical health program must *not* be the simple, natural one of saving lives. . . . It will seem rank heresy to propose that during the next twenty or thirty years not even severe epidemics in China should be attacked with every means available to modern medicine." Cook says, "These words, from a Christian, scientific-medical missionary required moral courage of a high order." I wonder why Messrs. Winfield and Cook have not proposed this "solution" to the UN Commission which is currently trying to solve the "overpopulation" of some parts of "Western" Europe? I wonder, too, how such a program (some people might call it genocide) would be received in Italy or the Netherlands? Dr. Winfield's "solution" for China made clearer to me a recent letter of a Chinese friend and colleague, an eminent scientist who spent many years in Europe and America before returning to China a few years ago—at the time, incidentally, to serve under the Kuomintang government. "Once freed from that vicious combination of internal and external exploiters," he reports, "this country is making astoundingly rapid progress in all spheres of its life." After reading Dr. Winfield's solution, I understand his bitter addition: "But Wall Street and Washington apparently do not approve that there should be progress anywhere in the world"!

Vogt in his *Road to Survival* is equally forward with similar "solutions." He inveighs against "the modern medical profession, still framing its ethics on the dubious statements of an ignorant man who lived more than two thousand years ago . . . [which] continues to believe it has a duty to keep alive as many people as possible." (P. 48.) And he praises "the wisdom" of the ancient Greeks who "were aware of the constant threat of overpopulation, and purposefully reduced the danger by prostitution, infanticide, emigration, and colonization." (P. 58.) Like my Chinese colleague, James Fyfe, an English scientist, feels "the peculiarly disgusting character of the [Malthusian] version which is now emanating from the other side

of the Atlantic," and he appropriately calls it *Malthusiasm* (*Modern Quarterly*, Summer, 1951). I leave it to the reader to draw the relation, if any, between Malthusiasm and the reliance of American political and military leaders on the *schrecklichkeit* of scientific, "fantastic," new weapons; or the proposal of a Congressman (so fittingly named Gore) to lay down a "dehumanized belt" of radio-activity along the 38th parallel in Korea.

Mr. Cook, in addition to approving the "moral courage" of such "solutions," follows in the footsteps of the good Rev. Malthus. "A millenium of 'social justice' which would assure all gifted children in depressed areas every opportunity for education and advancement would prove a disaster if the present birth differentials continued." (P. 267.) But Mr. Cook himself does not offer a solution of such high "moral courage" as Dr. Winfield's. His "remedy" is to start a big scientific project "for a simple, foolproof contraceptive tablet no more expensive than an aspirin tablet. Ideally, it should produce temporary sterility when taken by mouth." (P. 296.) Mr. Cook adds that "a few drug manufacturers are exploring the problem on their own initiative, and there is little doubt that such a tablet could be made if research to fill the need were given a high priority." Indeed, a drug which will cause the resorption of the foetus—it is hoped without harm to the mother, at least in animal experiments—has just been announced and acclaimed. Malthusians have been quick to point out that this drug could be mixed into food which women would eat unwittingly, but it seems to me that this would raise very much the same ethical and political issue on which the world has already passed judgment in condemning Hitler's program of forced sterilization. I do not intend to argue the social usefulness of birth control when it is voluntarily undertaken. Its efficacy is indeed demonstrated by the statistics on declining birth rates in many countries. I am concerned here with the false reasoning which ascribes poverty to "population pressures," and with a morality which condones genocide.

What is bothering the Malthusians and why has Malthusianism become a popular subject in America? An answer was provided by Dr. Warren S. Thompson in the *Annals of the American Academy of Political Science* (January, 1945). The growth of the population of China and Southeastern Asia, Dr. Thompson says:

means a differential development of manpower in favor of southeastern Asia as compared with western Europe and North America which is just the reverse of that which took place during a large part of the 19th century and the early years of the 20th. We may have been justified in ignoring such a differential growth in population in the past when it was working to the

MONTHLY REVIEW

advantage of the western European peoples, but we can scarcely afford to do so in the future.

And he concludes with the nub of the whole problem:

How will these peoples of Asia feel a few decades hence when southeastern Asia and China, plus Japan, have three or four times the population of central and western Europe and North America, if we still hold most of this region as colonies and continue to exploit them as we are now doing? Will they continue to be as subservient as in the past? Is it not time that we began to take account of this new differential in population growth and for the sake of expediency, if we are not moved by considerations of justice, began to plan a world in which we shall be a small minority with a diminishing proportion of the world's industrial power?

Whatever the explorations of drug manufacturers or the proposals of the Malthusians may lead to, there is little doubt that the peoples outside of "western civilization" need have nothing to do with them. They are demanding—and can achieve—"rapid progress in all spheres of their life," to quote my Chinese friend again. Frank W. Notestein, Director of the Princeton University Office of Population Research, points out the way taken by a large number:

It is not in the Far East but in Eastern Europe and the USSR that the most significant new developments are occurring. This quarter of the world has a large population which until recently has been technologically backward. But these peoples are now rapidly acquiring the skills needed to turn their fairly abundant resources into economic products. Barring major catastrophes or the grossest sort of mismanagement, they should achieve rapid increases in per capita production and in population during the next few decades. In industrialization they should advance rapidly because they are moving along a path already well charted by the Western world. Their populations should grow swiftly because they are getting the knowledge and the production with which to reduce their high death rates. This segment of the human race is the one that would seem to have the best chance, among the hitherto backward peoples, of becoming a major new focus of political power in the world and of maintaining its position. (*Scientific American*, Sept. 1951, p. 28.)

As an American scientist, I am profoundly concerned with the underlying disease in our own society and culture, of which Malthusianism and other "remedies" (for example, dianetics) are mere

"scientific" symptoms. Under the title "The Hidden Revolution," *The Nation* (May 26, 1951) gave headline billing to a review of Cook's book. While expressing some doubts (very genteelly) of its basic thesis, the reviewer nevertheless ended with a laudation of its "general message." Thus, even a liberal cultural organ can slip to the point of appearing to approve the degradation of our culture. Instead of helping the backward people of the world to make "rapid progress in all spheres of their life," a goal for which they are striving in the not so "hidden revolution" of a world-wide colonial struggle, shall we offer them—a sterility tablet? And should our scientists receive "high priority" to work on this project? Our science would then become identified in the public mind with producing human sterility as well as with hydrogen and plutonium bombs, bacterial and chemical warfare, guided missiles, and space ships, to list only the known "fantastic weapons." The "dehumanized belt" which is threatening our culture and our science would then completely wall off these great American resources not only from foreign peoples (which it is already doing thanks to the McCarran Act and the State Department) but also from the American people themselves. Under these conditions, how long can science and culture—and even a people—remain alive?

MERRY CHRISTMAS!

*Over the Land of Morning Peace
Our civilizing bombers fly
And in the twinkling of an eye
From communism grant release.
The storied cities, old as Rome,
Vanish in flame in half an hour.
The people, freed by Christian power,
Die in the ashes of their home.
Americans, whose life has been
Devoted to a baseball hurled
Through nineteen summers, proudly bring
On burnished, flashing, flying wing
From far across a watching world
The gift of jellied gasoline.*

—Hugh Hardyman

REFORMISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

BY NATALIE MOSZKOWSKA

In July 1951, at a meeting in Frankfurt-am-Main, the Socialist International—a union of Social Democratic parties of all countries—was reconstituted. The Socialist International, generally known as the Second International, which was founded in 1889 collapsed in the first World War. Revived in 1923, it met an inglorious end in the second World War. A common policy to prevent war was never adopted by the associated socialist parties. Such a policy would have presupposed that the socialist parties of the different countries were really devoted to internationalism, that internationalist manifestoes were more than lip service to the cause.

Why did internationalism have to succumb to nationalism? Can purely reformist parties, such as the Social Democratic parties are, remain true to declarations of internationalism? It is with these problems that we shall deal in this article.

The central problem of capitalist economy—an economy which expands production and throttles consumption—is the problem of economic crises. For the past century, economists have been pre-occupied with the questions: How can crises of overproduction be eliminated or at least postponed? How can the growing surplus of unsold goods be disposed of and the excess of accumulated capital be invested?

It would be possible through social reforms of the kind recommended by the socialist parties, reforms in the grand manner, to raise the purchasing power of the masses, to expand the market, to absorb surplus commodities, and hence to avoid crises and unemployment. But reforms, because of the bitter opposition of the bourgeoisie, are actually very modest and are only partially carried out. In practice, they do not suffice to prevent crises.

Because of the inadequacy of reforms, the consumption of the

Natalie Moszkowska, a native of Warsaw, went to the University of Zürich, Switzerland, during World War I and has lived in Zürich ever since. In the period before Hitler, she was a frequent contributor to German and Austrian socialist periodicals. She is the author of Das Marxsche System, Berlin, 1929; Zur Kritik moderner Krisentheorien, Prague, 1935; and Zur Dynamik des Spätkapitalismus, Zürich, 1943. This article is a slightly revised chapter from a forthcoming book entitled Krise und Krieg (Crisis and War).

masses grows very slowly if at all. At the same time, thanks to technical progress, the volume of consumption which could be supported and which would actually be required to keep the system on an even keel, rises with extraordinary rapidity. The consequence is that capitalism's susceptibility to crises increases in accelerated tempo with the development of the system.

As long as socialists are no more than a minority in parliaments — and this is still the case in most of the western and central European states — the work of reform makes but little headway. A long period must intervene before a parliamentary majority is in a position to institute reforms on a more considerable scale. During this period, the socialist parties find themselves in a position in which they must again and again help the capitalist state to ward off crises and unemployment that threaten all the social achievements of the past. They must not only accept but actually promote with all the force at their command bourgeois measures which at any given moment seem calculated to ameliorate economic disturbances.

Now, one way which every capitalist state adopts to put off, or soften the impact of, overproduction crises is to reduce imports and expand exports of manufactured goods, in other words, to unload commodity surpluses onto other states, to exclude foreign commodities and force its own commodities onto foreigners. Every government seeks to relieve its own unemployment at the expense of other countries, "to export unemployment." Frequently, this provokes international quarrels.

In order to gain new markets, new outlets for capital investment, and new sources of raw materials, each power has long made strenuous efforts to acquire colonies and spheres of influence in which it enjoys special advantages over other powers. In the ensuing scramble to divide up the world, the rival powers inevitably come into conflict with one another.

In such soil — a veritable spawning bed for international tensions — internationalism, an essential element of socialism, cannot thrive. On the contrary, economic policies of the kind described act as so many powerful spurs to nationalism. And until it acquires a parliamentary majority, a reformist socialist party finds itself forced to support capitalist economic measures, or at least to tolerate them instead of fighting them. Inevitably, the result is that socialist-international solutions are pushed into the background in favor of bourgeois-national solutions. And this in turn blocks the development of a common program by the socialist parties of the various countries and prevents the international solidarity of the working class from coming to the fore.

MONTHLY REVIEW

Since the methods which bourgeois states use in combating crises lead to international tensions and provoke a whole host of conflicts, they inevitably lead to the building up of armaments. In the final stage of capitalism, when susceptibility to crises is at its height and the most elaborate policies with respect to production, trade, transport, and money are unavailing — in this stage of capitalism, governments must strive to an ever increasing extent to solve the problem of crises and unemployment by means of armaments.* It is especially difficult to square such measures with socialist principles.

It is not at all easy for socialist parties to adhere to socialist-internationalist principles in a period characterized in the highest degree by international tensions. Socialism is fundamentally pacifist and humanist, opposed to all policies based upon force. It is part of the spirit of socialism to strive for conciliation, hence for a policy of disarmament, for the avoidance of international frictions. It is not at all a part of the spirit of socialism to foster an arms race and to precipitate warlike conflicts.

It is of course true that many socialist-backed reforms, such as amelioration of the direst forms of poverty and raising the living standards of the workers, have been of great importance. But the path of "reform only" — the concentration of the whole party apparatus on the winning of more seats in parliament — which made it necessary for socialists, decade after decade, to support the economic policies of the bourgeoisie and of national self-interest, has led to nationalism, militarism, and imperialist expansion. In time, the socialist parties could not but grow impeccably patriotic. (In this respect, bourgeois-democratic parties have been more consistent: they were nationalistic from the outset.)

In the case of western and central European Social Democracy, the displacement of internationalism did not begin with the voting of war credits in the first World War (August 1914). It began much earlier, with the support of the protectionist policies of the bourgeoisie. The voting of war credits and the supporting of governments internally and externally in war time (the policy of fighting to the end) merely brought the betrayal of internationalism into the open. The socialist parties voted for war credits because their orientation had long been in a bourgeois-nationalist direction. Later, this absence of international solidarity among Social Democratic

* Even if there were today no conflict between East and West, and no war in Korea, still massive armaments would be built as a means of avoiding a crisis of overproduction and mass unemployment. What the business world would like is a "permanent condition of war." The armistice talks at Kaesong provoked a "peace panic."

REFORMISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

parties became glaringly obvious when Hitler was threatening the western European states. Then, instead of standing together, the various parties merely tried to save their own countries from fascist aggression.

It is no wonder that the Socialist International refused to participate in the struggle against war, that it became increasingly an "International of Nationalists," that nationalism finally triumphed over internationalism, that the pacifist-socialist international languished while the war-breeding capitalist international prospered.

The ideologies of nationalism and class struggle are fundamentally incompatible, just as national consciousness and class consciousness are incompatible. Internationalism is a fundamental requirement of the socialist movement. The sacrifice of international principles leads to destruction.

At first, it seemed the easiest course to agree to the measures adopted by the bourgeois state to combat crises: it was the path of least resistance. But what seemed the least dangerous course in the short run turned out to be the most dangerous in the long run. For, by tolerating or even supporting bourgeois economic policies the socialists helped to *prolong* the life of capitalism. But the latest stage of this system is characterized by a growing susceptibility to enormous catastrophes. The reformist-socialist path did, to be sure, avoid civil wars, but it promoted far bloodier world wars.

Even if there had been no Communism in Russia and no fascism in Germany and Italy, it is hardly likely that the second World War could have been avoided. The line-up would merely have been different. In this stage of the development of our economic system, every war is welcomed by capitalist interests. For every war "solves" the market and crisis problems and sets the stage for easy profiteering. (On all this, I refer the reader to my book *Zur Dynamik des Spätkapitalismus*, Zürich, 1943.)

The only kind of party that can remain true to international principles is a genuinely radical socialist party: a party which decisively rejects the economic and hence the international policies of the bourgeoisie, and which champions only socialist measures; a party which aims at the most rapid liquidation of the crisis-breeding system and at the reconstruction of society.

Radical tactics (a policy of opposition with corresponding propaganda) would have proved much less bloody than the reformist tactics of the moderate socialists even if civil war had not been avoided. Radical tactics would merely have had to *shorten* the final stage of capitalism which is so prolific of catastrophes. If the working class had consistently opposed the economic policies of the

MONTHLY REVIEW

bourgeoisie, in particular if it had fought decisively against imperialism and militarism, and if it had followed a logical peace policy, then the capitalist economic system would soon have come to the end of its rope and socialism would have been able to step forward as its successor.

When the reformist parties, which wanted to follow a democratic path to socialism, accepted the economic policies of bourgeois states, they promoted, even if only indirectly, monopoly capitalism and militarism, imperialism and annexationism. But the state form which is suited to fully developed monopoly capitalism and militarism is absolutism, an authoritative political system, not democracy, not political liberalism. The whole spirit of monopoly capitalism and militarism is opposed to the essentials of democracy. The concentration of much power in few hands is opposed to democracy. Militarism and monopoly as political factors encroach upon the liberal-democratic attitude; and insofar as they produce anti-democratic tendencies, they pave the way for fascism. They cut out from under democracy the very ground on which the work of reform must rest.

In addition, the larger the burden of armaments the smaller the scope for reforms. Militarism reduces the living standards of the people, blocks social progress.

Military armament as a rule is followed by moral *disarmament*. But real democracy demands a high moral level from a nation.

Reformist socialism is fundamentally pacifist and evolutionist. But out of pacifism has grown militarism, and out of evolutionism the disorder and disruption of world wars.

Social Democracy would like to travel the parliamentary road to socialism, to use only peaceful methods, and hence to realize socialism with a minimum of friction — a process which, from a humanitarian and cultural point of view, is doubtless most desirable. Actually it achieves the opposite of what it aims at: instead of the building up of democracy, its destruction; instead of a democratic-pacifist epoch, a period of history in which everything is dominated by military power.

"FREE WORLD" DEPARTMENT

Yanceyville, N. C., Nov. 14—A Negro tenant farmer, accused of assault with intent to rape for "looking" at a white girl 75 yards away, went on trial here today before a crowded courtroom.

—New York Post, Nov. 14, 1951.

A Gift Of Lasting Value

Date _____, 195__

MONTHLY REVIEW
66 Barrow Street
New York 14, N. Y.

Send **MONTHLY REVIEW** for one year to
(Please print)

Name _____ Address _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

and **THE TRUTH ABOUT SOCIALISM** to
(Please print)

Name _____ Address _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

I enclose:

- ☐ \$3.00 for a one-year subscription.
☐ \$4.00 for a one-year subscription plus **THE TRUTH ABOUT SOCIALISM**.

(Add 50¢ for any address outside continental U. S.)

Fill out the slips below; we will detach and send them to the recipients.



Greetings

To _____

I hope you will find **MONTHLY REVIEW** as enlightening and informative as I do. It is coming to you as a gift

From _____

Greetings

To _____

THE TRUTH ABOUT SOCIALISM is an important book about an important subject. It is coming to you as a gift

From _____

A Gift Of Reading Material

Name _____

MONTHLY REVIEW
60 Madison Street
New York 17, N. Y.

Send Monthly Review for one year to _____

Name _____

Address _____

Send The Youth Agency Bulletin to _____

Name _____

Address _____

I enclose _____

☐ \$3.00 for a one-year subscription

☐ \$6.00 for a one-year subscription plus The Youth Agency

Subscription

(Add \$1.00 for one additional subscription if 2)

Fill out the slips below; we will detach and send them to the

respective _____

Giftings

Name _____

I hope you will find Monthly Review an enlightening and inspiring

read and we are sending you a gift

Name _____

Giftings

Name _____

The Youth Agency Bulletin is an inspiring book about an inspiring

and we are sending you a gift

Name _____

(continued from inside front cover)

that socialists will have their word to say when also in the "free world" socialist construction will be a practical problem.

Your remarks ["Memo to Graduate Students," Oct. 1951] regarding the necessity to study United States capitalism not only for consumption in the United States itself but also abroad, will get the wholehearted support from all socialists all over the world.

We all know so little about the United States and we have to know so much. A history of the United States of America (written in terms of historical materialism) is very badly needed. Some explanation of the failure of the New Deal, the real nature of which is not understood abroad, etc.

Your practical proposal referring to the study of the interrelationship between military and Big Business is interesting. But may I ask (I am not informed of the progress made during the past years) whether it has been already established why the policies of American capitalism have changed. Is it known why United States—up to now so "generous" in comparison to other countries—is curtailing civil liberties, why it has started a new way of colonialism?

I think that it is much easier to examine all aspects of this capitalism, once this "why" has been established.

There is one more "why" which is bothering all socialists in the world. Why, though having the highest developed capitalist structure in the world, this country does not have a worker party?

Studying all these problems, you would do a great thing for the proletarian movement all over the world, and you would help, I think, your own.

Begging your pardon again, and hoping that you will understand my secretiveness, I remain, very truly yours, A Foreign Socialist.

Monthly Review Associates have asked us to announce that on Thursday, December 20, 1951, they will present the second of their series of meetings for the 1951-52 season. It will be "An Indian Evening" featuring Mr. Kumar Goshal, well-known writer and lecturer, who will play records of his native land. Lecture and discussion to follow. Details of time and place will be announced later. Meanwhile, keep the date open and line up your friends to come with you.

Another MRA announcement: Those readers in the Philadelphia area who are interested in forming an Associates group there, are invited to attend a meeting at 1712 North Park Avenue on Friday, January 4. For further details write to Jim Webster, 1816 No. 15th Street, or phone him in the evening, STevenson 4-5594.

Subscription Book Offers For Renewals Or New Subscriptions

- ☐ \$3 for a one-year subscription
 - ☐ \$4 for a one-year sub and *The Truth About Socialism*
 - ☐ \$5 for a two-year subscription
- (For address outside U.S.: add 50c for 1-year sub, \$1 for 2-year sub)
- ☐ Renewal ☐ New Subscription

Name Street.....

City Zone State

Monthly Review — 218 West 10th Street — New York 14, N. Y.

Monthly Review Pamphlet Series

No. 1. WHY SOCIALISM? by Professor Albert Einstein

Another printing of the warm human declaration for socialism by the world's most famous scientist.

10c per copy 12 for \$1 100 for \$5

No. 2. INSIDE THE UNITED NATIONS

by A Special Correspondent

Two articles by a close observer of the UN since its inception, which have created a sensation both here and abroad.

25c per copy 6 for \$1 40 for \$5

No. 3. SOCIALISM IS THE ONLY ANSWER

by Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy

Three articles, two of which have never been published in MR. The third is a reprint of the now famous editorial from the May 1951 issue.

25c per copy 5 for \$1 30 for \$5

Back Issues of Monthly Review

are still available at the regular price of 35c per copy with the following exceptions:

VOL. I, NO. 1 — \$2 per copy

VOL. II, NO. 6 — \$2 per copy

VOL. II, NOS. 5, 7 — unavailable except in an order for all twelve issues of VOL. II.

VOLUME I, Complete — \$5

VOLUME II, complete — \$7

All prices include postage. Address your orders to
MONTHLY REVIEW • 218 West 10th Street, New York 14, N. Y.

